

REMARKS

Claims 1-8, 10-21, 23-36 and 38-49 are pending in this application. By this Amendment, claims 1, 2, 13, 23, 24 and 38 are amended, claims 9, 22 and 37 are cancelled without prejudice to or disclaimer of the subject matter contained therein, and claims 47-49 are added. No new matter is added. Reconsideration of the application is respectfully requested.

Applicants appreciate the courtesies shown to Applicants' representatives by Examiner Wallerson during the August 15, 2005 personal interview. Applicants' separate record of the substance of the interview is incorporated into the following remarks.

Applicants also appreciate the allowance of claims 10-12. As discussed during the personal interview, Applicants added claims 47-49, which are based on claims 10-12. Thus, for at least these reasons, Applicants submit that claims 47-49 are allowable. Applicants also appreciate the indication that claims 2-8, 14-21, 24, 26-36 and 40 contain allowable subject matter. Applicants amended claims 2 and 24 to respectively incorporate the features of original claims 1 and 23, from which they depended. For at least these reasons, claims 2 and 24 are allowable. For the reasons discussed below, Applicants submit that all pending claims are allowable.

Claims 1, 9, 13, 22, 23, 25, 37, 38, 39 and 41-46 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102(e) over U.S. Patent No. 6,735,740 to Sakai et al. (Sakai). The rejection of claims 9, 22 and 37 is rendered moot by the cancellation of those claims. The rejection of the remaining claims is respectfully traversed for at least the following reasons.

As discussed during the personal interview, Claims 1, 13 and 23 are amended to respectively incorporate the features of cancelled claims 9, 22 and 37. With regard to the features recited in original claims 9, 22 and 37, page 3 of the Office Action states that Fig. 6 of Sakai discloses dividing means for dividing the layout area into a text area for laying out

the text data and an image area for laying out the image data. Applicants respectfully disagree at least because Fig. 6 of Sakai exemplifies a document image which is scanned and captured by a scanner (col. 6, lines 20-21). The document image thus captured is provided to the partial image extracting unit 11 (col. 6, lines 21-23).

Fig. 7 of Sakai shows the result of structurizing or layout recognition of the document image shown in Fig. 6, and FIG. 8 shows partial images extracted by the partial image extracting unit 11. Fig. 14 is a flowchart showing the details of the process for displaying a partial image. As shown in Fig. 14, steps S41 and S42 merely involve relocating and sizing partial images, and in no way suggest dividing the layout area according to a predetermined ratio. As discussed during the personal interview, Sakai fails to disclose dividing, according to a predetermined ratio, a layout area into text area and image area for laying out text data and image data, respectively, when it is determined that both text partial image and graphic partial images exist in the document.

For at least these reasons, Applicants submit that Sakai fails to disclose or suggest dividing means for dividing, when the determination made by the determination means indicates that one or plural pieces of data includes the text data and the image data, the layout area into a text area for laying out the text data and an image area for laying the image data according to a predetermined ratio, as recited in amended claim 1.

Accordingly, Applicants submit that Sakai fails to disclose or suggest all the features recited in independent claims 1, 13 and 23 including, *inter alia*, the dividing means for dividing, when the determination made by the determination means indicates that the one or plural pieces of data includes a text data and the image data, the layout area into a text area for laying out the text data and an image area for laying out the image data according to a predetermined ratio, as recited in amended claim 1, and as similarly recited in step s) of amended claim 22, and as an area dividing program, in amended claim 23. For at least these

reasons, Applicants submit that Sakai fails to disclose or suggest all the features recited in independent claims 1, 13 and 23, as well as all the features recited in claims 3-8, 10, 11, 12, 14-21, and 25-46. It is respectfully requested that the rejection be withdrawn.

In view of the foregoing, it is respectfully submitted that this application is in condition for allowance. Favorable reconsideration and prompt allowance of all pending claims are earnestly solicited.

Should the Examiner believe that anything further would be desirable in order to place this application in even better condition for allowance, the Examiner is invited to contact the undersigned at the telephone number set forth below.

Respectfully submitted,



James A. Oliff
Registration No. 27,075

Maryam M. Ipakchi
Registration No. 51,835

JAO:MMI/ccs

Attachment:
Amendment Transmittal

Date: August 16, 2005

OLIFF & BERRIDGE, PLC
P.O. Box 19928
Alexandria, Virginia 22320
Telephone: (703) 836-6400

<p>DEPOSIT ACCOUNT USE AUTHORIZATION Please grant any extension necessary for entry; Charge any fee due to our Deposit Account No. 15-0461</p>
--